



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

which the future action of either party in China may be judged and to the terms of which either nation may be held accountable by the other and by all other nations whose concerns are affected. It is well, therefore, to study the provisions of this agreement and to keep them in mind when alarmists on either side of the Pacific raise their voices.

First, it is recognized that Japan has "special interests" in China, and rightfully so, but neither do these special interests give Japan the right to interfere with the trade of other nations, nor do they permit Japan herself to infringe upon either the independence of the Chinese people or the integrity of their territorial possessions. It is further specifically declared that no nation—Japan, the United States, or any other—can, with the good will of either of the two parties to the agreement, acquire any rights or privileges prejudicial to Chinese freedom, either of the Government or of territory, "or that would deny to the subjects or citizens of any country the full enjoyment of equal opportunity in the commerce and industry of China."

This is the "Open Door" as before, with one thing added, and doubtless a most necessary thing at this time. At the two sides of the portal of freedom of opportunity for trade in China stand two watchmen, Japan and the United States, whose privilege and duty it is to see that the hospitality thus offered is not abused. When the second youngest republic of the world shall have reached man's estate, it will perform that office for itself. Until then it is surely not unfitting that its greatest fellow-democracy and its nearest neighbor nation shall combine in its protection, especially as each separately and both conjointly are peculiarly fitted for that office.

It has been said, and will again be said, that in the Lansing-Ishii agreement are the seeds of infinite misunderstandings of Japan's actions in China in the future. But these seeds were there before, carefully fenced from molestation by the fact that the United States and Japan had never come to any open understanding concerning Chinese operations. Now that fence is down. The seeds may sprout, but with the issue definitely joined between the two countries, they may also, by fair and judicious interpretation of the agreement already entered into, be uprooted and destroyed. Much more depends, perhaps, upon the future interpretation of the agreement than upon the fact of agreement. We should not blind ourselves to the fact that the work is not yet finished, but should, on the contrary, realize that this is but the first step in an adequate and just disposal of Far Eastern problems. For future steps to lead to peace they have only to follow the direction of free and open co-operation and reciprocal compromise

indicated in this first venture. What has been done can be done again, and this is the hopeful interpretation of the agreement with Japan.

## THE COURSE OF THE STORM

"THE more violent the storm the sooner it is over" was the saying of a certain Stoic philosopher named Seneca, who pursued his studies of the weather at the very beginning of the Christian Era. No one will deny that the storm now upon the world is raging fiercely, and that it is increasing; that men and wealth and ideals are buffeted by the winds, and that we are concerned to know the course of the storm.

The situation seems darker to some than to others. One writer assures us that our Victorian worship of a "secular deity of progress" was all a fatuous mistake. He assures us that the rising tides of the new age have "swept away nearly all the Victorians," with all their faiths in an "inevitable progress." The storm is upsetting our writers. It is upsetting others. Our mariners of State do not escape. The conditions in Russia, in Italy, and in the chancellories everywhere, indicate still thicker weather ahead.

From our point of view, the most threatening aspect of the storm is the darkness, by which we mean the things we do not know. We do not know where the dangerous rocks are, and, which is worse, we do not seem to know where they are not. We have already had our attention called more than once to "false dawns" and camouflage rainbows, but in the main we are still quite in the dark.

For example, we are far from clear about the conditions in Germany. Under date of November 5th, Berlin informed us through the Associated Press, by way of London, that the leader of the Centrist party, Mathias Erzberger, had said in an interview that, "While the troops of the Central Allies were forcing their way across Tagliamento, Germany at home quietly crossed the political Rubicon, and in the space of five days changed from an autocracy into a democracy." He went on to say that "This has been the most momentous week since the founding of the empire. Its achievement represents a permanent political gain for the German people." . . . "In view of the July and October happenings, the majority leaders were convinced of the hopelessness of permitting the old system to prevail. Through the Chief of the Civil Cabinet they imparted their convictions to the Crown, urging the imperative need of a co-ordinate, cohesive governmental policy in foreign and domestic issues and harmonious governmental collaboration with the Reichstag, during the war

at least." He said that Foreign Minister von Kuhlmann had participated in the conferences and urged on the Crown the need of instituting a parliamentary procedure; that such was the only solution of the crisis, "because of the unfavorable impression that would be made abroad if the current attempt failed to succeed." We were told that Dr. von Kuhlmann was desirous that the outside world should know that "a new political era has set in in Germany." We were given to understand by this interesting leader of the Centrum that the majority leaders and the new Chancellor von Hertling were in complete harmony upon these issues.

So far as we are able to discover, the American press has not commented upon these statements. Lacking official backing, they may not be significant. Are we or are we not warranted in believing that there is a disposition on the part of an influential portion of the German Government to meet the terms set forth by President Wilson in his reply to the Pope? It is unfortunate for our steersmen that the charts do not reveal the facts here.

Sometimes we seem warranted in the belief that flickering lights of constitutional reforms are discernable along the shores of Germany. We do not believe that Dr. Kuno Francke, writing recently for *Harpers*, is justified in the assumption that the American Government wishes to interfere with these reforms, to interfere with German leadership that supports the socialized popular activities of Germany, or to overthrow the German "rule of experts supervised by popular assemblies." Surely we of America will not object to the German policy of subordinating individual happiness to common tasks, so long as those tasks do not interfere with the common tasks of the rest of us. Dr. Francke seems to grant that there must be a sweeping away of caste monopolies within the German States, an enlargement of the sphere of parliamentary influence, and a liberalization of the authority of the expert functionary. But these things are far from repugnant to America. Most of us would be willing to go further and grant, with Dr. Francke, that if Germany is defeated, as she must be, she will be victorious in the sense that the rest of us will be forced to adopt many of her methods of socialized work. But all this is more academic than helpful as we strive just now to see our course.

We are quite in the dark about the precise nature of the ultimate victory we are destined to win in our conflict with the Imperial German Government. Evidently the Allies mean a military victory, which we interpret to mean an official statement by the German people that they have fought long enough and that they wish to come to terms. Lacking this, the storm will continue

to increase; of this we feel sure. In the language of President Wilson, the policy of the United States is "to bring the German Government to terms and end the war." Here in ten words is the job set before us. We are going about the business, and we are hastening in the going. But Germany defeated as France was in '71 may easily mean another era of "revenge," this time east of the Rhine, with its additional preparations for another and a more horrible war. Just how we are to handle this situation is not yet clear, and so the storm goes on and the darkness deepens.

With the intelligence at our command, perhaps the most comforting thought is that since the storm, already great, is increasing, we may take some hope from Seneca's casual observation.

### JOHN WATSON FOSTER

JOHN WATSON FOSTER, Secretary of State under President Harrison, for many years a life member and Vice-President of the American Peace Society, died at his home in Washington Thursday, November 15, 1917. The funeral services were held at the Church of the Covenant, Washington, Friday, after which the body was taken to Evansville, Indiana, the former home of the venerable diplomat, where interment took place the following Sunday.

Mr. Foster, father-in-law of Secretary of State Lansing, was for many years the dean of America's diplomatic corps. At the beginning of the Civil War he was practicing law in Evansville. He entered the Union Army in 1861 as major of the Twenty-fifth Indiana Volunteers. He was promoted to lieutenant-colonel at Fort Donaldson, and to colonel at Shiloh. He served as Minister to Mexico, 1873-80; to Russia, 1880-1; to Spain, 1883-5, and, upon the invitation of the Emperor of China, he participated in the peace negotiations with Japan, 1897, and represented China in the Second Hague Conference, 1907. Among his well-known works are: "A Century of American Diplomacy," "American Diplomacy in the Orient," "Arbitration and the Hague Court," "The Practice of Diplomacy"; and "Diplomatic Memoirs" (two volumes).

Mr. Foster's services to the American Peace Society were more than perfunctory. His advice was often sought, and his services were freely given, sometimes as member of the nominating committee, sometimes as the author of a contributed article to this magazine—in whatever capacity always helpfully and constructively. In the death of John Watson Foster the American Peace Society has lost a most valued friend and cherished councillor.